



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/887,519 | 06/22/2001 | Mark A. Baloga | 076507-0385 | 5752 |

7590 08/27/2002

Walter E. Zimmerman
FOLEY & LARDNER
Firststar Center
777 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53202-5367

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

FITZGERALD, JOHN P

[REDACTED] ART UNIT

[REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

3637

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/887,519 | BALOGA ET AL.  |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| John P Fitzgerald | 3637 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-56 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 11, 14, 18 and 44 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 June 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5-9.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed 10/15/2001 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each U.S. and foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. Specifically, copies of references A26, B27, B29, B30, C31, C32 and C33 are not present. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Specification Objections

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: incorrect section headings and sequence of the content. Appropriate correction is required. The applicant is reminded of the proper content and sequence of the specification:

Content of Specification

- (a) Title of the Invention: See 37 CFR 1.72(a) and MPEP § 606. The title of the invention should be placed at the top of the first page of the specification unless the title is provided in an application data sheet. The title of the invention should be brief but technically accurate and descriptive, preferably from two to seven words may not contain more than 500 characters.
- (b) Cross-References to Related Applications: See 37 CFR 1.78 and MPEP § 201.11.
- (c) Statement Regarding Federally Sponsored Research and Development: See MPEP § 310.
- (d) Incorporation-By-Reference Of Material Submitted On a Compact Disc: The specification is required to include an incorporation-by-reference of electronic documents that are to become part of the permanent United States Patent and Trademark Office records in the file of a patent application. See 37 CFR 1.52(e) and MPEP § 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text were permitted as electronic documents on compact discs beginning on September 8, 2000.

Or alternatively, Reference to a "Microfiche Appendix": See MPEP § 608.05(a). "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.

- (e) Background of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(c). The specification should set forth the Background of the Invention in two parts:
 - (1) Field of the Invention: A statement of the field of art to which the invention pertains. This statement may include a paraphrasing of the applicable U.S. patent classification definitions of the subject matter of the claimed invention. This item may also be titled "Technical Field."
 - (2) Description of the Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 37 CFR 1.98: A description of the related art known to the applicant and including, if applicable, references to specific related art and problems involved in the prior art which are solved by the applicant's invention. This item may also be titled "Background Art."
- (f) Brief Summary of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(d). A brief summary or general statement of the invention as set forth in 37 CFR 1.73. The summary is separate and distinct from the abstract and is directed toward the invention rather than the disclosure as a whole. The summary may point out the advantages of the invention or how it solves problems previously existent in the prior art (and preferably indicated in the Background of the Invention). In chemical cases it should point out in general terms the utility of the invention. If possible, the nature and gist of the invention or the inventive concept should be set forth. Objects of the invention should be treated briefly and only to the extent that they contribute to an understanding of the invention.
- (g) Brief Description of the Several Views of the Drawing(s): See MPEP § 608.01(f). A reference to and brief description of the drawing(s) as set forth in 37 CFR 1.74.
- (h) Detailed Description of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(g). A description of the preferred embodiment(s) of the invention as required in 37 CFR 1.71. The description should be as short and specific as is necessary to describe the invention adequately and accurately. Where elements or groups of elements, compounds, and processes, which are conventional and generally widely known in the field of the invention described and their exact nature or type is not necessary for an understanding and use of the invention by a person skilled in the art, they should not be described in detail. However, where particularly complicated subject matter is involved or where the elements, compounds, or processes may not be commonly or widely known in the field, the specification should refer to another patent or readily available publication which adequately describes the subject matter.
- (i) Claim or Claims: See 37 CFR 1.75 and MPEP § 608.01(m). The claim or claims must commence on separate sheet (37 CFR 1.52(b)). Where a claim sets forth a plurality of elements or steps, each element or step of the claim should be separated by a line indentation. There may be plural indentations to further segregate subcombinations or related steps. See 37 CFR 1.75 and MPEP § 608.01(i)-(p).
- (j) Abstract of the Disclosure: See MPEP § 608.01(f). A brief narrative of the disclosure as a whole in a single paragraph of 150 words or less commencing on a separate sheet following the claims. In an international application which has entered the national stage (37 CFR 1.491(b)), the applicant need not submit an abstract commencing on a separate sheet if an abstract was published with the international application under PCT Article 21. The abstract that appears on the cover page of the pamphlet published by the International Bureau (IB) of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) is the abstract that will be used by the USPTO. See MPEP § 1893.03(e).

Art Unit: 3637

- (k) Sequence Listing. See 37 CFR 1.821-1.825 and MPEP §§ 2421-2431. The requirement for a sequence listing applies to all sequences disclosed in a given application, whether the sequences are claimed or not. See MPEP § 2421.02.

Drawing Objections

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR § 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: reference numeral "52" on page 6, line 3, referring to passages for routing of cables does not appear anywhere in the drawings. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 11 is objected to under 37 CFR § 1.75(c), as being a duplicate of claim 1 and for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Dependent claim 11 recites the limitation of: "at least one display device coupled to the display support." Independent claim 1 recites this limitation in line 1.

4. Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities: word omission. Place the word "the" before "track" and after "mounted to." Appropriate correction is required.

5. Claim 18 is objected to because of the following informalities: a period punctuation mark is present in line 6. Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 3637

6. Claim 44 is objected to under 37 CFR § 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Dependent claim 44 recites the limitation of: "at least one display device coupled to the display support." Independent claim 34 recites this limitation in line 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 1-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, claims 1, 18, 34, 51 and 52 recite the phrases "may" or "may be," thus rendering the claims and their dependent claims indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

9. Claims 7, 8, and 12-14, recite the limitation "support" in each of their first lines. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. As best understood, claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Worrell et al. Worrell et al. disclose a movable support system (Figs. 1-3) for at least one display device (col. 1, lines 10-12) comprising: a linear (col. 4, line 10) track system (30) (col. 1, lines 62-65) mounted on furniture (10); a base (44) which is non-pivotsably cantilevered (col. 1, lines 53-59 and col. 2, lines 25-28, 44-45) and movably mounted perpendicularly (Fig. 3) at a first section (46) to the track system; a display support assembly (54) including a plurality of arms (56, 58, 60, 62) adapted for coupling of the display device and pivotally mounted (col. 1, lines 58-61) at a second section (48) of the base; management of one or more cables at least partially through one passage (190) and a groove (36) (Fig. 4) wherein the display device installed on the display support assembly is selectively positioned for use in a variety of locations relative to the track system (col. 1, lines 53-61).

12. As best understood, claims 34-37, 39, 40, 44-47 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Worrell et al. Worrell et al. disclose a movable support system (Figs. 1-3) for at least one display device (col. 1, lines 10-12) configured to be coupled to utilities such as power or data through cables, comprising: a linear (col. 4, line 10) track system (30) (col. 1, lines 62-65) mounted on furniture (10); a base (44) which is non-pivotsably cantilevered (col. 1, lines 53-59 and col. 2, lines 25-28, 44-45) and movably mounted perpendicularly (Fig. 3) at a first section to the track system (46); a display support assembly (54) including a plurality of arms (56, 58, 60, 62) adapted for coupling of the display device and pivotally mounted (col. 1, lines 58-61) at a second section (48) of the base; management of one or more cables at least partially through one passage (190) and a groove (36) (Fig. 4) allowing it to be configured to be coupled to utilities such as power or data through cables (col. 2, lines 44-63), wherein the display

device installed on the display support assembly is selectively positioned for use in a variety of locations relative to the track system (col. 1, lines 53-61).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. As best understood, claims 5 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Worrell et al. as applied to claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 11-14 above, and further in view of Baloga et al. Worrell et al. disclose a movable support system for at least one display device having every recited element as stated previously. Worrell et al. fail to disclose a movable support system for at least one display device having a work surface mounted over the track or configured to use in a works space providing at least one mobile table and wherein the support is at a height above the mobile table. Baloga et al. teach a workspace (Fig. 5) having a work surfaces (108, 109) (col. 15, lines 2-15) mounted over a mobile table (101) (col. 15, lines 25-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place the movable support system for at least one display disclosed by Worrell et al. in the workspace, further adding work surfaces placed above the track and a mobile table beneath the support as taught by Baloga et al. for increasing the work space for the user.

15. As best understood, claims 8 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Worrell et al. as applied to claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 11-14 above, and further in

view of Nam. Worrell et al. disclose a movable support system for at least one display device having every recited element as stated previously. Worrell et al. fail to disclose a movable support system for at least one display device wherein the support includes a hub providing for management of one or more cables coupled to the display device. Nam teaches a hub (20) (Figs. 3-5) display device support (12) providing management of plural cables coupled to the display device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a the hub display device support taught by Nam, modifying the passage (190) on the movable support system for at least one display device disclosed by Worrell et al. for managing cables connected to the display and other peripheral devices (col. 1, lines 29-65).

16. As best understood, claims 9, 10 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Worrell et al. as applied to claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 11-14 above, and further in view of Leveridge et al. Worrell et al. disclose a movable support system for at least one display device having every recited element as stated previously. Worrell et al. fail to disclose a movable support system for at least one display device wherein the display support includes a pair of flanges and a pair of articulating arms and a display device is attachable to each of the pair of arms, and is further configured for coupling of two display devices or panels. Leveridge et al. teach a display support device (Fig. 1) supporting two panels (26, 28) attachable to each of the pair of articulating arms (20, 22), two flanges (38) extending from a base (16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the display support device having all the attributes above as taught by Leveridge et al., modifying the movable support system for at least one display device disclosed by Worrell et al. for

increasing the total display screen area, as well enabling the user to achieve greater efficiency in a smaller space (col. 2, lines 12-28).

17. As best understood, claims 18-21, 23, 24, 27-31 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Worrell et al. in view of Leveridge et al. Worrell et al. disclose a movable support system (Figs. 1-3) for at least one display device (col. 1, lines 10-12) comprising: a linear (col. 4, line 10) track system (30) (col. 1, lines 62-65) mounted on furniture (10); a base (44) which is non-pivotably cantilevered (col. 1, lines 53-59 and col. 2, lines 25-28, 44-45) and movably mounted perpendicularly (Fig. 3) at a first section (46) to the track system; a display support assembly (54) including a plurality of arms (56, 58, 60, 62) adapted for coupling of the display device and pivotally mounted (col. 1, lines 58-61) at a second section (48) of the base; management of one or more cables at least partially through one passage (190) and a groove (36) (Fig. 4) wherein the display device installed on the display support assembly is selectively positioned for use in a variety of locations relative to the track system (col. 1, lines 53-61). Worrell et al. fail to disclose an apparatus providing a movable support for a display device wherein the display support includes a pair of flanges and a pair of articulating arms and a display device is attachable to each of the pair of articulating arms, and is further configured for coupling of two display devices or panels. Leveridge et al. teach a display support device (Fig. 1) supporting two panels (26, 28) attachable to each of the pair of articulating arms (20, 22), two flanges (38) extending from a base (16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the display support device having all the attributes above as taught by Leveridge et al., modifying the movable support system for at least one display device disclosed by Worrell et al. for increasing the total display screen area, as well

enabling the user to achieve greater efficiency in a smaller space (col. 2, lines 12-28).

Specifically regarding claim 27, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to relocate the articulating arms to the ends of the flanges, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art.

In re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950).

18. As best understood, claims 22 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Worrell et al. and Leveridge et al. as applied to claims 18-21, 23, 24, 27-31 and 33 above, and further in view of Baloga et al. Worrell et al. and Leveridge et al. disclose an apparatus providing a movable support for a display device having every recited element as stated previously. Worrell et al. and Leveridge et al. fail to disclose an apparatus providing a movable support for a display device having a work surface mounted over the track or configured to use in a works space providing at least one mobile table and wherein the support is at a height above the mobile table. Baloga et al. teach a workspace (Fig. 5) having a work surfaces (108, 109) (col. 15, lines 2-15) mounted over a mobile table (101) (col. 15, lines 25-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place the movable support system for at least one display configured to be coupled to utilities such as power or data through cables disclosed by Worrell et al. in the workspace, further adding work surfaces placed above the track and a mobile table beneath the support as taught by Baloga et al. for increasing the work space for the user.

19. As best understood, claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Worrell et al. and Leveridge et al. as applied to claims 18-21, 23, 24, 27-31 and 33 above, and further in view of Nam. Worrell et al. and Leveridge et al. disclose an

apparatus providing a movable support for a display device having every recited element as stated previously. Worrell et al. and Leveridge et al. fail to disclose an apparatus providing a movable support for a display device wherein the support is pivotably coupled to the support at a hub and manages wires through the hub. Nam teaches a hub (20) (Figs. 3-5) display device support (12) which is pivotably coupled to the hub, and which provides management of plural cables coupled to the display device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a the hub display device support taught by Nam, modifying the passage (190) on the movable support system for at least one display device disclosed by Worrell et al. and Leveridge et al. for managing cables connected to the display and other peripheral devices (col. 1, lines 29-65).

20. As best understood, claims 38 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Worrell et al. as applied to claims 34-37, 39, 40, 44-47 and 50 above, and further in view of Baloga et al. Worrell et al. disclose a movable support system for at least one display device configured to be coupled to utilities such as power or data through cables having every recited element as stated previously. Worrell et al. fail to disclose a movable support system for at least one display device configured to be coupled to utilities such as power or data through cables having a work surface mounted over the track or configured to use in a works space providing at least one mobile table and wherein the support is at a height above the mobile table. Baloga et al. teach a workspace (Fig. 5) having a work surfaces (108, 109) (col. 15, lines 2-15) mounted over a mobile table (101) (col. 15, lines 25-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place the movable support system for at least one display configured to be coupled to utilities such as power or data through

cables disclosed by Worrell et al. in the workspace, further adding work surfaces placed above the track and a mobile table beneath the support as taught by Baloga et al. for increasing the work space for the user.

21. As best understood, claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Worrell et al., as applied to claims 34-37, 39, 40, 44-47 and 50 above, and further in view of Nam. Worrell et al. disclose a movable support system for at least one display device configured to be coupled to utilities such as power or data through cables having every recited element as stated previously. Worrell et al. fail to disclose a movable support system for at least one display device configured to be coupled to utilities such as power or data through cables wherein the support includes a hub providing for management of one or more cables coupled to the display device. Nam teaches a hub (20) (Figs. 3-5) display device support (12) providing management of plural cables coupled to the display device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a the hub display device support taught by Nam, modifying the passage (190) on the movable support system for at least one display device configured to be coupled to utilities such as power or data through cables disclosed by Worrell et al. for managing cables connected to the display and other peripheral devices (col. 1, lines 29-65).

22. As best understood, claims 42, 43 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Worrell et al., as applied to claims 34-37, 39, 40, 44-47 and 50 above, and further in view of Leveridge et al. Worrell et al. disclose a movable support system for at least one display device configured to be coupled to utilities such as power or data through cables having every recited element as stated previously. Worrell et al. fail to disclose a movable

support system for at least one display device configured to be coupled to utilities such as power or data through cables wherein the display support includes a pair of flanges and a pair of articulating arms and a display device is attachable to each of the pair of arms, and is further configured for coupling of two display devices or panels. Leveridge et al. teach a display support device (Fig. 1) supporting two panels (26, 28) attachable to each of the pair of articulating arms (20, 22), two flanges (38) extending from a base (16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the display support device having all the attributes above as taught by Leveridge et al., modifying the movable support system for at least one display device configured to be coupled to utilities such as power or data through cables disclosed by Worrell et al. for increasing the total display screen area, as well enabling the user to achieve greater efficiency in a smaller space (col. 2, lines 12-28).

23. As best understood, claims 51- 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Worrell et al. in view of Baloga et al. Worrell et al. disclose a movable support system (Figs. 1-3) for at least one display device (col. 1, lines 10-12) comprising: a linear (col. 4, line 10) track system (30) (col. 1, lines 62-65) mounted on furniture (10); a base (44) which is non-pivotably cantilevered and movably mounted perpendicularly at a first section to the track system (46); a display support assembly (54) including a plurality of arms (56, 58, 60, 62) adapted for coupling of the display device and pivotally mounted (col. 1, lines 58-61) at a second section (48) of the base; management of one or more cables at least partially through one passage (190) and a groove (36) (Fig. 4) wherein the display device installed on the display support assembly is selectively positioned for use in a variety of locations relative to the track

system (col. 1, lines 53-61). Worrell et al. fail to disclose a movable support system for use in a workspace having an entrance. Baloga et al. teach a workspace (Fig. 1) (col. 7, lines 21-40) having an entrance for user ingress and egress there through. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place the movable support system disclosed by Worrell et al. in the workspace taught by Baloga et al. for the improved freedom of user movement and comfort (col. 7, lines 39-40). Regarding the recitations of claims 51-56 in relation to a person's or group of person's body orientation or position, changes in a person's or group of person's body orientation or position relative to the workspace environment for the viewing or inability to view information contained on the display device taught by Worrell et al. and Baloga et al. are considered to be inherent, and as such, do not constitute a limitation in any patentable sense.

Conclusion

24. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US 2,182,703 to Rainwater teaches a desk with a sliding support, US 4,323,291 to Ball teaches a desk with wire management, US 4,561,619 to Robillard et al. teaches a movable display pedestal mounted on a track, US 4,659,048 to Fahrion teaches a supporting device for a data display unit mounted on a track in various configurations, US 4,732,089 to Mueller teaches a roller-equipped platform movably supported on a tabletop with a guide track, US 4,852,500 to Ryburg et al. teaches a computer workspace area with a monitor mounted to an articulating arm, which in turn rides along a rail, US 5,321,579 to Brown et al. teaches a flat electronic display mounted on an articulating arm which in turn is mounted on a track, US 6,099,093 to Spence teaches a computer desk having two work surfaces, US 6,317,316 to Bentley et al. teaches a

Art Unit: 3637

display hub allowing for the management of wires, US 6,409,134 to Oddsen, Jr. teaches a articulating arm apparatus for mounting electronic equipment with cable management through recesses and guide-ways, US 6,343,006 to Moscovitch et al. teaches a computer display screen system and adjustable screen mount with articulating arms capable of supporting a plurality of monitors, DE 3132015 to Fischer et al. teaches a visual display unit for use by several operators mounted on a displaceable turntable set on guide rails, and GB 2127682 to Metcalf et al. teaches workspace furniture capable of nesting and allowing for multiple levels of workspaces.

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John P. Fitzgerald whose telephone number is (703) 305-4851. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00 AM to 3:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai, can be reached on (703) 308-2486. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)-872-9302 before final action, and (703) 872-9327 after final action. Any inquiry of a general nature relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-1113.

JF
08/07/2002

LANNA MAI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Lanna Mai